

8-10 New McLean Street

DRAFT

Urban Design Study

Prepared for
DPHI

Issued
June 14 2024

Gadi Country
Level 2, 490 Crown Street
Surry Hills NSW 2010

T 61 2 9380 9911
E sydney@sjb.com.au
W sjb.com.au



SJB acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the lands, waters, and skies, and their perpetual care and connection to Country where we live and work. We support the Uluru Statement from the Heart and accept its invitation to walk with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in a movement of the Australian people towards a better future.

DRAFT

We believe that inequity enshrined in our society continues to significantly disadvantage our First Nations colleagues, friends, and community. Following the referendum, we are personally and professionally recommitting our support of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. We will continue to strive for (re)conciliation by acting with integrity and passion, in an effort to address this imbalance in our country and create lasting generational change.



Certified Management Systems

ISO 9001:2015 Quality Management System
ISO 45001:2018 Occupational Health & Safety Management System
ISO 14001:2015 Environmental Management System

Version: 01
Ref: 6944
Prepared by: BR, JM
Checked by: FL

Gadi Country
Level 2, 490 Crown Street
Surry Hills NSW 2010

T 61 2 9380 9911
E sydney@sjb.com.au
W sjb.com.au

SJB Architecture (NSW) Pty Ltd
ABN 20 310 373 425
ACN 081 094 724

Nominated Architects
Adam Haddow 7188
Emily Wombwell 10714
John Pradel 7004
Jonathan Tondi 11981
Nick Hatzi 9380

Contents

01	Executive Summary	4	04	Preferred Approach	25
	Purpose of This Study	4		Illustrative Plan	26
	Planning Proposal	5		Massing	27
	Panel Findings & Recommendations	6		Sections	28
	Proponent Response	7		Shadow Study	29
	Process	8		Visual Impact	30
	Parameters	9		Indicative Podium Plan	32
	Options	10		Indicative Upper Plan	33
	Key Moves	11	05	Recommendations	34
	Preferred Approach	12		Envelope & Controls	35
02	Parameters	13	06	Appendix: Options Study	36
	Trees & Biodiversity	14		Option 01a	37
	Overshadowing	15		Option 01b	38
	Heritage	16		Option 02a	39
	Setbacks & Streetwalls	17		Option 03a	40
	Visual Impacts	18		Option 03b	41
	Summary	19			
03	Key Moves & Objectives	20			
	Setbacks	21			
	Alignment	21			
	Separation	22			
	Trumper Park Overshadowing	22			
	Address Context	23			
	Articulation	23			
	Ground Plane & Sleeved Edge	24			
	Architecture	24			

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of study is to provide an independent urban design review on behalf of the Agile Planning Team. It is to considers the design principles set out by the Strategic Planning Panel and of the Planning Proposal (PP) for 8-10 New McLean Street, Edgecliff in accordance with the recommendations of the Strategic Planning Panel.

This study will:

- Review the planning proposal provided by the Proponent and the Panel recommendations in response to this planning proposal,
- Develop a series of design parameters,
- Develop a series of options informed by the Panel recommendations and parameters,
- Refine to a preferred option,
- make recommendations on an appropriate building envelope (height and floor space ratio), and
- Provide recommendations and urban design principles from which the Proponent will adopt.

Site Location

8-10 New McLean Street, Edgecliff is adjacent to the Edgecliff Commerical Centre and Edgecliff Train Station. The site is situated between the Edgecliff Centre, Trumper Park and the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) which is dominated by terrace houses.

New McLean Street is to the north of the site with no other adjacent streets. Side boundaries are aligned with adjacent properties and the southern boundary is aligned to Trumper Park. The southern extent of the boundary is dense vegetation and tree canopy cover, that also extends into the site.

The site currently consists of two small residential flat buildings (walk-ups) consisting of mostly small, low-cost dwellings.



KEY

Site Boundary

ECC Boundary

1:5000 @ A3



A - Site from New McLean St



B - Site from Trumper Oval






C - Site from Cameron Street

Planning Proposal

A planning proposal prepared by the Proponent (Holdmark) has been developed to represent a 22 storey and 4.5:1 FSR scheme. The scheme consists of 2 buildings including 1 tower. The scheme also provided a new through-site link from New McLean Street to Trumper Park. The Proponent suggests that the planning proposal has strategic merit given that:

- The planning proposal aligns with NSW strategic planning frameworks. In particular the Eastern City District Plan, Section 9.1 Directions, SEPPs, the Transit Orientated Development (TOD) Program and the Low and Mid-rise Housing Reforms.
- The planning proposal aligns with current government priorities for housing targets, infill affordable housing and Transport Oriented Development.
- Responds to a change in circumstances of key infrastructure investment and opportunity, and housing priorities.
- Edgecliff is the only centre in Woollahra LGA that meets the criteria in the District Plan for a Local Centre.
- Edgecliff is identified in the Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS) for new jobs and new housing.
- The scale of uplift proposed is appropriate in comparison to nearby regional and local centres.
- The scale of uplift is compatible with the context of the Draft ECC Strategy.
- 3D and urban design modeling has demonstrated site-specific merit and compatibility with neighbours and setting.
- The draft ECC uplift will be slow to deliver new housing and jobs due to land fragmentation, ribbon development, classified road frontage constraints.
- The Planning Proposal is “project ready”.
- The Planning Proposal delivers direct community, economic and infrastructure benefits to a wide catchment.



All images extracted from Proponents Planning Proposal

Panel Findings & Recommendations

In response to the Planning Proposal, the Strategic Planning Panel disagreed with the scale of density and height proposed, making several recommendations for the Proponent to consider, including for an independent urban design study (this report) to confirm site capabilities.

The Panel agreed that the planning proposal has Strategic Merit for increased residential development in the following regards:

- The planning proposal is consistent to applicable strategic planning documents and relates to the general objectives for housing in Sydney.
- Delivering housing supply is a priority issue for Sydney for all levels of Government.
- The provision of additional housing in this location has strategic merit due to its proximity to transport, employment and commercial facilities.

The Panel agreed that the planning proposal can achieve Site Specific Merit subject to revisions addressing site constraints noting that:

- The planning proposal would support housing within close proximity to services, employment and public transport
- The (current) proposed significant height and bulk is not considered in context with the current and future character of the Edgecliff Commercial Centre (ECC) and does not respond appropriately to the heritage conservation area within which the site fits and in particular Trumper Park.

Panel Recommendations

- The Agile Planning Team, on behalf of the Panel, arrange an independent urban design review which considers the design principles set out below and makes recommendations for an appropriate building envelope, including height and floor space ratio (FSR), for the site.
- At least 5% of the Gross Floor Area (GFA) is to be affordable housing.
- The proposed through-site link is to be removed.
- No net loss of residential units.

Panel Design Principles

- R3 Medium Density zone to be maintained.
- Increases in height must provide a transition to Trumper Park and the adjoining residential development within the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area.
- Proposed height of any tower should step down from the Edgecliff Commercial Centre to reflect the height strategy of the draft Edgecliff Commercial Centre Strategy.
- Height of any podiums need to relate to adjoining development and open space areas.
- A height guide of 12 storeys with a transition to the adjoining low density residential development and Trumper Park.
- Overshadowing of Trumper Park and residential development within the HCA, views and potential biodiversity impact need to be considered.




Maintain R3 Medium Density Residential (and any additional permitted uses removed).



Transition height to Trumper Park and adjoining residential development within Paddington Heritage Conservation Area.



12 Storey Height with transition to low density residential and Trumper Park.



Consider overshadow of Trumper Park and Residential, views, and potential biodiversity impacts.



Relate massings to adjacent Edgecliff Commercial Centre. Maintaining integrity and dominance of the Edgecliff Centre.




Revise FSR reflective of appropriately designed proposal.

Proponent Response

In response to the Panels recommendations, the Proponent presented a scheme that would be both compliant with the recommendations, and also achieve the density they desired for the site. The response adjusts the proposal to:

- Maintain R3 Zoning on the site and removes non-residential uses.
- Remove the proposed through-site link.
- Refine an envelope which considers retention of trees, overshadowing of Trumper Park and the adjacent terraces houses to the east.
- Reduce building height from 22 Storeys to 12 Storeys.
- Reduces the FSR from 4.5:1 to 4.25:1.
- Transition height to respond to the adjacent terraces.
- Establish a street wall height which responds to the Edgecliff Centre.




Site Area
7,226 sqm


Initial observations

In review of the proponents response to the Strategic Planning Panel’s recommendations and design principles, we have made the following observations:


- The zero setback from the southern terrace houses raises concerns for interface and retention of existing significant trees along the south-eastern boundary
- a 12m separation between floors above 4 storeys on the southern mass would be difficult to achieve ADG compliance and for provision of residential amenity, the depth and shape of the footprints, in particular the podium levels of the south- eastern block, may be difficult to achieve an efficient layout and may also compromise residential amenity.





Envelope Development
Solar Compliance



All images extracted from Proponents presentation provided 07.05.2024



Massing - Maintain 2Hrs Solar to Eastern Terraces
Sun Eye Views - 21/June




Process

Given the Proponents Planning Proposal and the Panel’s recommendations, this study has sought to identify an appropriate outcome for the subject site that considers an urban design argument from first principles.

The study started with determining a series of parameters for the site. These parameters are largely defined from information provided in the Planning Proposal and the panels recommendations. Collectively, the parameters are used to inform a series of design options for the site. These options represent variable approaches to site layout, height and density to inform a preferred approach for the site.

Following the options study, a series of key moves and objectives were evident, which are also informed by the parameters. The key moves step through the approach to designing an outcome for the site that is responsive to the surrounding context and mitigates impacts on surrounding areas.

To represent an appropriate outcome, a preferred approach has been provided alongside a number of recommendations that will guide any future development on the site. The preferred approach is one representation of an urban response that fits within the key moves, objective and recommendations. These recommendations are as a result of this study, and not a direct response to the Panel’s recommendations.




Parameters

The parameters summary compiles the multiple factors which influence the overall envelope that can be developed within.

Key elements of the parameters are:

- Setbacks as a result of DCP provisions, ADG criteria, and the retention of existing high quality tree canopy cover,
- Limitations to height due to overshadowing of Trumper Park Oval, in which case the shadow line of the existing trees is considered, and
- The interface and relationship with the ECC and adjacent terraces and Heritage Conservation Area.

The Parameters section of this report provides further detail and context to each of the individual items.




Trees & Biodiversity




Overshadow




Heritage



Setbacks & Streetwalls



Visual Impacts



Parameters Plan

Options

Following the establishment of the parameters, a number of options were developed that fit within the opportunities and constraints of those parameters. These options are reflective of the various elements such as street wall height, setbacks, tree canopy retention, scale, interface, and more.

The options were explored under three main orientations:

- **North-South**
Follows the alignment of the buildings currently on the site and provides opportunity for additional retention of existing trees in the center of the site.
- **Diagonal**
Aligns with the north-western boundary edge and provides opportunity to respond more directly to the alignments of the HCA Terraces whilst still permitting appropriate angles for ADG solar compliance.
- **Alternating**
Follows the north-western boundary edge for the proposed northern footprint, while the southern massing aligns perpendicular with the western site boundary.

All options explored resulted in similar GFA and FSR's averaging around 2.5:1 at 12 storeys and 3.1:1 at 18 storeys. It was considered appropriate to increase height to 18 storeys to respond effectively to the context whilst still enabling substantial development density on the site. The height strategy is elaborated on further in this report.

From these options, a preferred approach was established (02b) that followed the diagonal alignment. The preferred option has been chosen due to it's opportunity to mitigate visual and overshadowing impacts on the surrounding area whilst maintaining an appropriate built form outcome that fits within the strategic context of the ECC and the HCA.

The options are presented in more detail in the appendix of this report.



01 - NORTH-SOUTH




02 - DIAGONAL




03 - ALTERNATING



01a
2.5:1 to
3.1:1





02a
2.5:1 to
3:1




03a
2.2:1 to
2.8:1



01b
2.6:1 to
3:1



02b
2.7:1 to
3.25:1




03b
2.5:1 to
3.1:1




Key Moves

In conjunction with the options study, a series of key moves have been developed that are both in response to the parameters and driving a desired outcome for the site. These key moves are discussed in more detail further in this report.




SETBACKS

Setbacks are defined by existing street setbacks of the HCA Terraces, ADG criteria, retention of trees, and deep soil.




ALIGNMENT

Alignment of the massing on the site is defined to ensure appropriate built form outcomes including adjacent relationships and ADG compliance.




SEPARATION

The large footprint of the site provides opportunity for separation into two buildings, creating a finer grain approach to the site whilst balancing good architectural possibilities.




TRUMPER PARK OVERSHADOWING

The overall envelope of the northern half of the site is formed to reduce overshadowing on Trumper Park, taking into account the shadows cast by existing trees..




ADDRESS CONTEXT

The envelope adjacent to the HCA Terraces is stepped to create transition between its neighbours and to create a street wall that reflects the ECC.




ARTICULATION

Maximise articulation of the envelope to optimise internal layouts and improve ADG compliance, whilst reducing overall bulk and scale of visual impact.



GROUND PLANE

Sleeving of the lower western levels along the sloping terrain, and providing open spaces between volumes to maximise site potential and delivery of communal open space.



ARCHITECTURE

Provide further articulation through architectural design to work with the surrounding aesthetic, including providing stepped terraces with planting to give the illusion of the building emerging from the trees.

Preferred Approach



The preferred approach is a result of the options study, refinement of the key moves in response to the parameters, and represents an outcome of the site that is driven by first-principles approaches to urban design. The resultant built form is 18 storeys and 3.25:1.

The preferred approach establishes:

- A street wall height 6 storeys, which is 1 lower than the proposed Edgecliff Centre, establishing an appropriate relationship in height,
- Better transition to the HCA by stepping down to 3 storeys, aligning with the adjacent terrace.
- Significant tree retention through the proposed articulation and setbacks to side boundaries.

Overshadowing of Trumper Oval is minimised by terracing of the western building to sit within a solar clipping plane aligned with the shadows created by existing trees in the park. The eastern building has no impact on the overshadowing of Trumper Oval and can therefore be taller.

The proposed 18 storeys is a result of creating a height transition downwards from the proposed Edgecliff Centre. Through further articulation as a result of the key moves and recommendations to streetwall and setbacks, visual impacts are also further reduced, creating a reasonable outcome for the site.



Trees & Biodiversity

Significance of trees and biodiversity of the site was reviewed through an Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report by Urban Arbor and a Biodiversity Assessment by Biosis.


Out of a total 203 trees assessed by Urban Arbor, 116 trees were identified to be impacted by proposed works on site and recommended to be removed. The protection of the root structures of the retained trees has been recommended and various approaches to reduce these impacts have been provided.

- “All landscaping works within the TPZ (Tree Protection Zone) of trees to be retained are to be undertaken in consultation with a consulting Arborist to minimise the impact to trees.”
- “Replacement planting for all trees recommended for removal should be incorporated into the landscape plan. It is recommended that at minimum one tree for each tree proposed to be removed are planted to maintain/increase overall canopy cover at the site when mature. Any replacement tree must be selected in accordance with AS2303-2015 Tree stock for landscape use.”

Within Biosis’ Biodiversity Assessment “a total of approximately 0.27 hectares of planted native vegetation was identified within the study area, of which up to 0.15 hectares would be removed by the proposed works. For the reasons outlined in the ToS, the proposed works, as currently designed, are deemed to not have a significant impact on the threatened species.


The below statement has been provided by Council in relation to the retention of trees:

- “The retention of trees and tree groups positioned close to boundaries is a best practice approach. The [bottom right] image (red polygon) shows the general location of the high value trees and tree groups positioned within the subject site which are suitable for retention.”



Key Findings

- Where possible, removal of trees should be minimised.
- Impact of vegetation within the adjacent Trumper Park must be avoided.
- Trees removed for proposed massings should be replanted to maintain or increase canopy cover on the site.



Overshadowing

Woollahra Development Control Plan 2015, C29 notes: “Solar access to the Trumper Park Oval is provided between the hours of 10am and 2pm on 21 June. Where existing overshadow is greater than this, sunlight is not to be further reduced.”

Existing shadows were surveyed by Norton Survey Partners at 10:00am, 12:00pm and 2:00pm as identified in the DCP.

These shadows were mapped by fjcstudios and identified 10:00am on 21 June as a key time that requires detailed design consideration.

Additionally, the Panel’s recommendations specify that: “Overshadowing of Trumper Park (not just the oval) and residential development within the heritage conservation area...needs to be considered.”



Key Findings

—

Proposed development should not further overshadow Trumper Park Oval.

—

Overshadowing of entire Trumper Park (not just oval) and surrounding residential must be considered .



Heritage

As assessed in Curio Projects 2023 Heritage Impact Statement, the site is located within the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area and in the vicinity of a number of heritage items. However, the subject site is not individually listed as a heritage item in the Woollahra LEP 2014 or on the State Heritage Register.

Two 5 storey apartment buildings are located on the site and contain a total of 106 apartments. Noted in Curio Project’s summary:

“The subject buildings do not meet the threshold of the relevant criteria to warrant local heritage listing. The buildings comprise no notable or residing architectural design elements or features of the buildings which attribute the buildings with the Sydney School style of architecture, nor are the buildings representative of the Sydney School architectural movement. The buildings are not rare within the Woollahra LGA and not unique or fine examples of their type.

It is acknowledged there are historical aspects of the site which should be considered and interpreted in any future development for the overall site. The site has some historical links forming part of the planned 1960s redevelopments for St James Edgecliff Glebe, and were associated with architects Clarke, Gazzard & Partners - an architectural practice of repute during the 1960s and 1970s (best known for the Wentworth Memorial Church in Sydney).”



Key Findings

- Site is located within the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area.
- Existing buildings on the site do not warrant local heritage listing.
- Historical aspects of the site should be considered in any proposed development.
- Impacts from proposed development onto the adjacent residential terrace houses should be minimised.



Figure 4.9: View towards the back of the Bowes Terraces from the footpath that runs along the subject site’s southern perimeter. The ‘Royal Terrace’ seen in fig 3.5 likely refers to the small path in front of these terraces. Source: Curio Projects 2022.



Figure 4.10: View of the Bowes Terraces from Cameron Street. The turning circle that provides pedestrian access to New McLean Street is directly to the right. Source: Google Maps 2022.



Figure 4.17: One of the site’s apartment complexes as viewed from the central lawn area, facing north. Source: Curio Projects 2022.

Setbacks & Streetwalls

Woollahra DCP 2015 - Chapter C1 - Paddington HCA

C1.3.13 Infill development (new development)

C9: Where there is a uniform building front setback, the infill development must align with the existing setbacks of adjoining buildings

C10.b: ... The pattern of setbacks must respect and take cues from the nearest contributory 19th or 20th century development and ensure that infill is recessive and does not visually dominate the streetscape.

C11: Rear and side setbacks (including side passages) must align with existing patterns, where visible from the public domain.

C12: Infill development must be sited to:
a) include sufficient deep soil landscaped area; and
b) have no adverse impact on significant trees on the site or adjoining land, including public land.

C1.4.5 Building height, bulk, form and scale

C3: The height, bulk, form and scale of infill and new development must be consistent with the predominant height, bulk, form and scale of appropriate adjoining buildings. Conformity with adjoining buildings is not appropriate in circumstances where the development site adjoins a building which is a substantially taller landmark building, or is a building considered to be intrusive due to its excessive height and incompatible design.

C4: At least 50% of the main ground level private open space of adjoining properties for a minimum of two hours between 9am and 3pm on 21 June. Where existing overshadowing is greater than this, sunlight is not to be further reduced.

C1.6.2 Views and vistas

C2: TC2 New development in the public and private domain should be designed and located to minimise the impact on existing vistas or improve existing vistas where possible.

A setback of 12m on the southern boundary and variable setback on the street boundary are added to retain trees on site.

*Note: While infill development under the WDCP relates to vacant sites, given the proposal will ultimately require the demolition of the existing buildings, the infill development provisions are considered relevant to guide the built form of future development on the site.

Key Findings

- Proposed development setbacks must align with the existing setbacks of the neighbouring buildings.
- Proposed development must not visually dominate the streetscape.
- Development must include sufficient deep soil landscaped area.
- Development must not adversely impact on significant trees on site and adjoining land.
- Surrounding private open space must receive a minimum of 2 hours sunlight on 50% of area or no further reduction where currently less..




Visual Impacts

Visual impact analysis was undertaken by Urbaine Design Group from a number of locations, a collection of these were included to guide parameters.


Reduction of visual impacts from Trumper Park Oval are of key importance. fjcstudios proposal of 22 storeys would conceal open sky from Trumper Park and Cascade Street.

Visual impact from the south-eastern Cameron Street are minimised by existing trees.

The 22 storey scale of the Planning Proposal exhibits visual heights similar to the adjacent Edgecliff Commercial Centre when viewed from a distance, however it would be more appropriate for the site massing to be visually smaller to provide prominence to the ECC strategy, ensuring it's hierarchy as the core of the center is maintained.



Viewpoint 01 - Rushcutters Bay Park




Viewpoint 04 - Trumper Oval



Viewpoint 02 - Cascade Street



Viewpoint 06 - Cameron Street



KEY

Proponent Proposal

ECC Proposed Skyline

Key Findings

- Reduce visual impacts from Trumper Park Oval.
- Visual impacts from the adjacent Cameron Street are minimised by existing trees.
- Proponent’s proposed heights of 22 Storeys does not provide a height transition from the Edgecliff Commercial Centre.



Summary

The parameters summary compiles the multiple factors which influence the overall envelope that can be developed within.

Key elements of the parameters plan are:

- Setbacks as a result of DCP provisions, ADG criteria, and the retention of existing high quality tree canopy cover,
- Limitations to height due to overshadowing of Trumper Park Oval, in which case the shadow line of the existing trees is considered, and
- The interface and relationship with the ECC and adjacent terraces and Heritage Conservation Area.



The adjacent image is a 3d spatial representation of these parameters, representing in particular the limitations to height across the site due to the above.



Key Moves & Objectives

DRAFT

Key Moves



Setbacks

Setbacks define the overall footprint which the preferred design can fit within. They are largely based on providing appropriate separation to neighbouring properties and for the retention of trees and street character.



1. Consideration to existing street setbacks of the adjacent HCA Terraces to align with DCP controls, along with the retention of existing high quality trees that contribute significantly to the existing street character and quality. Consideration is to be given to tree root zones as well as canopy protection.
2. Retention of existing trees along the eastern edge of the site and to provide an appropriate buffer between the existing terrace properties to the east and higher density development within the site.
3. ADG appropriate setbacks (min. 6m) to the north-western boundary to provide appropriate amenity considerations to neighbouring properties.
4. Min. 6m setback to the southern boundary to preserve trees and allow peripheral access if needed. The setback also allows for deep soil planting and a better interface and reduction of visual impact from Trumper Park.

Alignment

Alignment on the site defines the direction of overall massing with the intent to preserve amenity to future dwellings on the site, ensuring that appropriate solar access can be provided to living spaces and communal open spaces. The orientation also allows appropriate transition and separation to adjacent properties to mitigate visual and amenity impact.

1. Primary alignment to the north-western boundary edge. This alignment allows for appropriate solar access to dwellings based on angle to sun, without the need for considerable architectural articulation or alternative design of typical floor plates.
2. Secondary alignment to the southern edge to create an appropriate spatial relationship with the adjacent terraces and properties. This alignment is largely to be used for lower scale development and street walls within the site to ensure the interface is of appropriate scale.
3. Creation of a hinge point within the site that mediates between both orientations. This hinge point is located to the eastern portion of the site to accommodate for an appropriate built form outcome in the part of the site that can achieve greater height.

Key Moves



Separation

Separation within the site is considered to minimise building footprints, ensuring an appropriate scale and grain to the street frontage and resultant built form. This is done to avoid a large footprint that is not consistent with the surrounding typology.



1. A smaller footprint to the north to provide a standalone building that sits under the height conditions of the parameters, largely defined by overshadowing of Trumper Park Oval.
2. A larger footprint to the south-eastern portion of the site that allows for greater density in part of the site that can accommodate increased height. This footprint is to be broken up further as desired to accommodate an appropriate scale and relationship with surrounding properties.
3. Min. 18m separation between the two blocks that allows for adequate ADG separation provisions for visual privacy and residential amenity. The exact alignment of the break in forms may shift north or south as desired, but appropriate footprints that ensure residential amenity is preserved is paramount.

Trumper Park Overshadowing

Further articulation and consideration is given to the northern envelope that considers overshadowing of the Trumper PArk Oval to ensure appropriate amenity for the park during the Winter Solstice (June 21)

1. No additional overshadowing of Trumper Park Oval at 10am on the Winter Solstice (June 21) as a result of the development.
2. The existing shadow line of the tree canopy within Trumper Park is to be considered as existing overshadowing on the Oval. The development is not to exceed this line.

Key Moves



Address Context

The southern development block is to consider it's relationship to the ECC and adjacent terraces, providing an appropriate scale, setback and street wall. Height of this block is a response to providing an appropriate transition between the surrounding context and the ECC proposed height strategy that shows the tallest development around Edgecliff Station.


1. Massing height along the southern edge is to match the existing scale of the terraces in the heritage conservation and to be appropriately setback to avoid visual impact. This is two result in a 2-3 storey street wall at the south-east edge of the site.
2. A secondary street wall height is created in relation to the street wall height of the neighboring Edgecliff Centre with an approximate 7 storey height that ensures consistency in the street character of New McLean Street.
3. Height of the remaining portion of the site is subject to providing an appropriate scale and interface with the ECC proposed heights adjacent to Edgecliff Station. 18 storeys is proposed as an appropriate height to accommodation sufficient development whilst also limiting visual impact and overshadowing of adjacent properties.

Articulation

Established envelopes as a result of previous moves including setbacks, overshadowing, street wall and interface, are to be be further articulated to provide an appropriate development footprint and scale. Steps in form and limitations to tower elements are introduced to generate an appropriate development typology for the site.

1. Setback upper level tower from the southern boundary to reduce visual impact, bulk and scale of development, and to ensure appropriate footprint size for residential amenity.
2. Further response to the terraces to create a contextually specific built form whilst also enabling appropriate residential typologies and increasing communal open space at ground for residents. Deep soil to be considered where possible. The exact articulation of this space to be a result of design testing and may change.
3. Articulation of the south-eastern edge to further retain existing high quality trees in this area. This edge deviates from the typical alignment here but is still to be responsive in scale to the adjacent terraces.
4. Terracing of the northern massing to create appropriate footprints and terraces on upper level that may be used for private or communal open space. Terraces to be landscaped to act as an extension of the tree canopy and biodiversity of the site.
5. Appropriate footprint size to be extruded to a maximum of 18 storeys total to create an appropriate scale interface with the ECC and surrounding areas.


Key Moves



Ground Plane & Sleeved Edge

The topography of the site steeply falls off from New McLean Street to Trumper Park. Sleeving this edge can introduce additional floor space whilst also creating a better interface with the park and providing alternative typologies.

1. Sleeve the western and northern edges of the site where possible with residential floor space to create a better interface with the park that avoids harsh edges that would otherwise likely be parking. Allow residents to engage with and use th edge of the site for communal open space where possible.
2. Introduce multi-storey terraces at the lowest levels between the two blocks to provide an alternative typology of dwellings and to capture the edge of the communal space between the blocks.
3. Deliver communal open space at ground in between buildings where possible to achieve greater deep soil and the retention of trees for biodiversity and amenity for residents.



Architecture

With the resultant mass, further attention to detail is to be given through architectural design and articulation to ensure the final outcome is of it's place and contextually appropriate. Special attention should b given to the greening of terraces and materiality of the final design.

1. Detail the facade using further architectural articulation to separate building elements and preserve the scale of the street wall and relationship to the surrounding context.
2. Add further greening with trees and planting to terraces and communal open spaces to make the building look like it is emerging from the tree canopy of the adjacent Trumper Park. Planting to be appropriate for the location using endemic species where possible.

Preferred Approach

DRAFT

Illustrative Plan

The preferred approach is an indicative response to the key moves and a result of the options study for the site. The result is one possible outcome that can be developed within the key moves and objectives. The recommendations following this section are the controls in which any future development is to be aligned.

The concept plan is a representation of the proposed built form for the site including application of building height, setback, street wall, open space, and tree canopy.

The site is separated into two distinct volumes with the western portion of the site limited from 5 to 9 storeys by overshadowing of Trunper Park, and the eastern portion at 18 storeys as a response to the key moves and contextual response to the ECC and surrounding areas. A number of at-grade communal open spaces are provided for residents along with private and communal open space on top of podiums and roofs where possible.

Setbacks between built form are to provide appropriate ADG provision compliance, ensuring residential amenity and visual privacy and ensuring direct solar access can be achieved to the majority of dwellings.

KEY

- Tree Retention Setback
- Setbacks
- Site Boundary
- 12+ Storey Height From Street



Massing




The preferred approach is a result of the options study, refinement of the key moves in response to the parameters, and represents an outcome of the site that is driven by first-principles approaches to urban design. The resultant built form is 18 storeys and 3.25:1.

The preferred approach establishes:

- A street wall height 6 storeys, which is 1 lower than the proposed Edgecliff Centre, establishing an appropriate relationship in height,
- Better transition to the HCA by stepping down to 3 storeys, aligning with the adjacent terrace.
- Significant tree retention through the proposed articulation and setbacks to side boundaries.

Overshadowing of Trumper Oval is minimised by terracing of the western building to sit within a solar clipping plane aligned with the shadows created by existing trees in the park. The eastern building has no impact on the overshadowing of Trumper Oval and can therefore be taller.

The proposed 18 storeys is a result of creating a height transition downwards from the proposed Edgecliff Centre. Through further articulation as a result of the key moves and recommendations to streetwall and setbacks, visual impacts are also further reduced, creating a reasonable outcome for the site.



View from Rushcutters Bay Park





View from Trumper Oval




View from Cameron Street HCA Terraces

Sections

The sections represent the approach taken to setbacks, street wall, and relationship to surrounding properties. They also represent how the height is based upon creating an appropriate contextual relationship between the ECC proposed heights and Trumper Park.



KEY PLAN



Shadow Study

The shadow studies display shadows created on 21 June (Winter Solstice) from 9am to 3pm. The proposed shadow impact is shown in blue, with existing shadows as black.


Shadows created by the ECC proposed are shown as orange.

At 9am the proposed shadow extent sits almost entirely within the shadow extent of the ECC proposed. At 10am, there a small impact to properties across Trumper Park, however these properties will receive adequate sunlight for the remainder of the day. From 12pm, private open spaces of the terraces in the adjacent properties are being impacted slightly by the proposed, however they are also being impacted by the proposed ECC massing and will still receive adequate sunlight throughout the day of greater than 3 hours total.


KEY

Preferred Approach Shadow


ECC Shadow




9AM




10AM




11AM




12PM



1PM



2PM




3PM


Visual Impact

Views have been recreated from Urbaine Design Group’s visual impact assessment report to demonstrate a comparative assessment between the preferred approach and the planning proposal massing .


Views from Rushcutters Bay Park demonstrate an appropriate transition between the ECC massing and surrounding areas with a similar effect taking place when viewed from Trumper Park. Compared to the planning proposal massing, there is a clear distinction and lack of hierarchy in the planning proposal with a 22 storey volume.



SJB PROPOSAL



Viewpoint 01 - Rushcutters Bay Park



Viewpoint 02 - Trumper Oval

PROPONENT PROPOSAL



Viewpoint 01 - Rushcutters Bay Park




Viewpoint 02 - Trumper Oval


Visual Impact

Views from Cascade Street demonstrate that the proposed largely sits within the ECC silhouette, whilst still providing appropriate visual hierarchy to the ECC massing. In comparison the planning proposal massing appears as the more dominant building in the skyline, interfering with the ECC massing.

From Cameron Street, situated between the terraces to the south-east of the site, the views are largely similar with street trees largely masking visual impact.



SJB PROPOSAL



Viewpoint 03 - Cascade Street



Viewpoint 04 - Cameron Street

PROPONENT PROPOSAL





Viewpoint 03 - Cascade Street



Viewpoint 04 - Cameron Street

Indicative Podium Plan




KEY

- 1 Bedroom
- 2 Bedroom
- 3 Bedroom
- Apartment Receiving Solar
- Cross Ventilation



Typical plan (F.04)

Scale 1:500 @ A3

0 5 10 15 20 25



Indicative Upper Plan



KEY

- 1 Bedroom
- 2 Bedroom
- 3 Bedroom
- Apartment Receiving Solar
- Cross Ventilation

Typical plan (F.04)

Scale 1:500 @ A3

0 5 10 15 20 25

Envelope & Controls


The recommendations for the subject site are based upon several factors including the establishment of the parameters, the option study, the key moves, and the preferred approach. These recommendations have been provided as a plan and 3d volume within which any future development may occur. Sufficient flexibility has been allowed in the envelope to enable architectural design intent whilst ensuring a good outcome for the site and neighbouring properties.

The adjacent table shows the recommended unit mix as a minimum and maximum percentage, and a recommended NSA. Both of these have been provided as a range to allow architectural articulation and design intent to guide the proposal within set parameters. The unit mix is determined based on the preferred approach opportunities, the indicative floor plans, and a desire to retain a high quantum of 1 beds in the local area. NSA range is based on ADG minimums to common market rates.

Gross Building Area defined from a massing model is converted to Gross Floor Area with an efficiency of 75% to achieve the FSR represented in the options study and preferred approach.

UNIT TYPE	MIN.	MAX.	NSA
1 Bedroom	30%	50%	50-60SQM
2 Bedroom	30%	50%	75-85SQM
3 Bedroom	20%	40%	95-110SQM

GBA > GFA	75%
-----------	-----



Appendix: Options Study


DRAFT

Option 01a

Option 1a proposes a built form of 18 storeys and an FSR of 3.1:1. The built form follows a north-south orientation, following an alignment parallel to the existing buildings on the site.

This option was not selected due to:

- The shape of the footprints, in particular the depth and angles created by the 5 & 6 storeys extensions, may be difficult to achieve an efficient layout.
- The close proximity of the tower to the south-eastern boundary results in a lack of transition and interface with the adjacent HCA terraces.
- The tower’s north-south orientation creates large visual impacts on the skyline, particularly when viewed from the south-west.



12 to
18
STOREYS

2.5 to
3.1:1
FSR

Option 01b


Option 1b proposes a built form of 18 storeys and an FSR of 3.1:1. The built form follows a north-south orientation, following an alignment parallel to the existing buildings on the site.

Option 1b takes a similar approach to 1a while attempting to reduce the number of acute angles and maximise GFA through a deeper northern podium.

Floors 13 to 18 are stepped in from the south to further reduce visual impact from key viewpoints.

The approach was not selected due to:

- Similarly to Option 01b, the shape of the footprints, in particular the depth and angles created by the 7 storey extension of the south-eastern massing, may be difficult to achieve an efficient layout.
- The close proximity of the south-eastern massing’s tower to the south-eastern boundary does not provide transition to the HCA terraces.
- The general form and layout of the buildings would be difficult to develop efficient layouts and may result in a lower overall yield.



12 to
18
STOREYS

2.6 to
3.1:1
FSR

Option 02a


Option 2a proposes a built form of 18 storeys and an FSR of 3:1. The built form follows a diagonal orientation, aligning with the north-western site boundary's edge.

Option 2a proposes a row of terrace apartments adjacent to the HCA terrace houses which steps upwards to 8 storeys and an 18 storey tower.

Similarly to Option 1b, Floors 9 to 18 are stepped in from the south to further reduce visual impact from key viewpoints.

The approach was not selected due to:

- The proposed terrace apartment alignment parallel to the south-eastern boundary creates an undesired interface with the HCA terrace houses. This interface would be preferred to arrange as a continuation of the terrace orientation rather than running perpendicular to them.
- The south-eastern massing's footprint creates a U shape private space that is open to the street with little protection and results in the lack of a prominent street wall along New McLean Street that responds to the ECC proposed massing.



12 to
18
STOREYS

2.5 to
3:1
FSR

Option 03a


Option 3a proposes a built form of 18 storeys and an FSR of 2.8:1. The built form follows an alternating alignment, where the northern mass aligns to its adjacent boundary, and southern mass aligns to the southern boundary.

Option 3a proposes a larger tower form stepping from 3 storeys to 18 storeys to maximise GFA in the available envelope.

3 storey extensions to the south introduce a street wall and a continuation of the terraces height adjacent to Trumper Park .

The approach was not selected due to:

- The south-eastern massing increases dramatically from 4 storeys directly to 18, creating a less desirable interface along the eastern boundary with the HCA terraces.
- The proposed tower may raise concerns for overshadowing on the HCA terraces due to the placement and angle, and overshadow the southern 4 storey extensions of the podium, making it difficult to achieve ADG compliance in lower levels.
- The lack of a secondary step in height between terraces and tower does not create a response to the proposed ECC street wall.



12 to
18
STOREYS

2.2 to
2.8:1
FSR



Option 03b

Option 3b proposes a built form of 18 storeys and an FSR of 3.1:1. The built form follows an alternating alignment, where the northern mass aligns to its adjacent boundary, and southern mass aligns to the southern boundary.

Similarly to Option 3a, Option 3b proposes a larger tower form stepping from 3 storeys to 18 storeys to maximise GFA in the available envelope.

Option 3b creates an internal private open space for residents between the two proposed massing and enclosed by extensions along site boundaries

The approach was not selected due to:

- Similar to Option 03a, the south-eastern massing’s close proximity to the south-eastern boundary edge, and increase from 3 storeys directly to 18 proves little height transition and interface to the terraces.
- The height of the tower may be difficult to achieve ADG compliance, and close proximity may raise concerns for overshadowing of the HCA terraces.
- The complexity of the footprints, in particular the south-eastern massing, may be difficult to achieve an efficient layout and may compromise residential amenity.

12 to



18

STOREYS

2.5 to

3.1:1

FSR



SJB is passionate about the possibilities of architecture, interiors, urban design and planning. Let's collaborate.

Gadi Country
Level 2, 490 Crown Street
Surry Hills NSW 2010

T 61 2 9380 9911
E sydney@sjb.com.au
W sjb.com.au



8-10 New McLean Street

DRAFT

Proponent Response Proposal

Prepared for
DPHI

Issued
July 12 2024

Gadi Country
Level 2, 490 Crown Street
Surry Hills NSW 2010

T 61 2 9380 9911
E sydney@sjb.com.au
W sjb.com.au



SJB acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the lands, waters, and skies, and their perpetual care and connection to Country where we live and work. We support the Uluru Statement from the Heart and accept its invitation to walk with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in a movement of the Australian people towards a better future.

DRAFT

We believe that inequity enshrined in our society continues to significantly disadvantage our First Nations colleagues, friends, and community. Following the referendum, we are personally and professionally recommitting our support of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. We will continue to strive for (re)conciliation by acting with integrity and passion, in an effort to address this imbalance in our country and create lasting generational change.



Certified Management Systems

ISO 9001:2015 Quality Management System
ISO 45001:2018 Occupational Health & Safety Management System
ISO 14001:2015 Environmental Management System

Version: 01
Ref: 6944
Prepared by: BR, JM
Checked by: FL

Gadi Country
Level 2, 490 Crown Street
Surry Hills NSW 2010

T 61 2 9380 9911
E sydney@sjb.com.au
W sjb.com.au

SJB Architecture (NSW) Pty Ltd
ABN 20 310 373 425
ACN 081 094 724

Nominated Architects
Adam Haddow 7188
Emily Wombwell 10714
John Pradel 7004
Jonathan Tondi 11981
Nick Hatzi 9380

Contents

01	Executive Summary	4
	Background and Purpose	4
	Summary of Analysis	5
	Recommended Building Envelope	6
02	Analysis	7
	Envelope & Controls	8
	Visual Impact	11
	Shadow Study	13
03	Resolved Envelope	14
	SJB Final Recommendation Envelope & Controls	15
	Envelope & Controls	16
	Shadow Study	17
	Visual Impact	18
	SJB Envelope Testing	20

Background and Purpose

In accordance with the recommendations of the Strategic Planning Panel (the ‘Panel’) of the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel, SJB was engaged by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (the ‘Department’) to undertake an independent urban design review of the Planning Proposal for 2-10 McClean Street, Edgecliff.

The Panel recommendation, identified principles that the urban design review was required to include, which are summarised below:

- **Maintain the R3 Medium Density zone**
Any uplift on the site is to achieve residential growth rather than provide commercial floor space.
- **Height transitions**
Increases in height must provide a transition to Trumper Park and the adjoining residential development within the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area (HCA)
- **Relationship to Edgecliff Commercial Centre**
Proposed height of any tower should step down from the Edgecliff Commercial Centre to reflect the height strategy of the draft Edgecliff Commercial Centre Strategy. The height of any podiums needs to relate to adjoining development and open space areas.
- **12 storey height guide**
A height guide of 12 storeys with a transition to the adjoining low density residential development and Trumper Park.
- **Overshadowing, view and biodiversity impacts**
Overshadowing of Trumper Park and residential development within the HCA, views and potential biodiversity impact need to be considered.

These principles, along with key relevant provisions of the Woollahra Development Control Plan (WDCP) and Apartment Design Guide (ADG) criteria, informed the parameters for SJB’s urban design review study. The study identified a preferred building envelope for the site, incorporating:

- A maximum building height of 18 storeys, ensuring a height transition stepping downwards from Edgecliff Commercial Centre (ECC)
- A 3 storey height transition to the HCA


- A 6 storey street wall height, being one storey lower than what it envisaged for the ECC
- Side setbacks allowing for retention of significant trees
- A resultant FSR of 3.25:1

SJB’s urban design study and preferred building envelope was presented to the proponent for review and the opportunity to respond. The proponent indicated they were generally supportive of the central strategies and conclusions reached by SJB, but requested that Department and SJB adopt the following five key points in finalising the recommendations to the Panel:


- Increase to tower envelope footprint 3m further to the south, and 6m closer to the east, bringing the distance from the boundary along Trumper Park from 15m to 12m, and the eastern edge of the tower envelope 6m closer to the low density residential terraces.
- Extend the lower podium envelope 3m to the east, changing the setback distances from 12m, 9m and 9m to the tower envelope, to 9m, 6m and 9m to the tower envelope, and connect to neighbouring terraces with additional extension to the boundary, maintaining tree retention along Trumper Park and New McLean Street.
- Increase 2 storey sleeve terraces in flex zone to 4 storeys, as the Proponent suggests the flex zone could comfortably increase the number of storeys without compromising view impacts and design principles.
- Adjust envelope heights to accommodate NCC and ADG requirements, such as adjustments to accommodate offset and terraced residential floors, lift overruns, balustrades, perimeter walls, rooftop plant, and rooftop access.
- Define a maximum envelope control separate to any nominated FSR control, as “formulating a numeric FSR control at this point in the Planning Proposal process risks rendering the subject site unviable...” and resultant FSRs from initial envelope testing may vary depending on approach, efficiencies and assumptions.

In support of these points, the proponent provided an amended building envelope.


In order to determine whether there is scope to incorporate the above feedback from the proponent, SJB has undertaken a comparative analysis of their previously preferred building envelope and the proponent’s adjusted building against the principles established by the Panel.



SJB's Initial Building Envelope



Proponent Response Envelope



COMPARISON BETWEEN INTIAL ENVELOPE AND PROPONENT RESPONSE

Process Diagram

Summary of Analysis

The design principles identified by the Panel formed the basis of SJB’s urban design analysis and their resultant preferred building envelope (SJB Initial Building Envelope). These principles have been used as criteria to assess the proponent’s amended envelope (Proponent’s Response Envelope) and determine the extent to which SJB Initial Building Envelope can be amended to accommodate the proponent’s five key feedback points.

Any potential amendments to the SJB Initial Building Envelope that incorporate the proponent’s feedback, must achieve the same level of performance against the design principles as the SJB Initial Building Envelope.

As can be seen from the table below, SJB Initial Building Envelope achieved all the principles, with the exception of the 12 storey height guide, which was partially achieved. That is, while the building height of 18 storeys exceeds the Panels guide of 12 storeys, it does not result in any unreasonable visual or overshadowing impacts. It also achieves an appropriate height transition and relationship to Edgecliff Commercial Centre.

Conversely, as well as exceeding the 12 storeys, the Proponent Response only achieves partial satisfaction with the principles relating to transition to the adjoining residential HCA or and the relationship to the Edgecliff Commercial Centre.

The analysis identified the following amendments could be made to the envelope to respond in part to the proponent’s feedback, without compromising the achievement of the design principles in the SJB Initial Building Envelope:

- Increase the envelope height (podium and tower) by 1m – 1.5m to accommodate NCC and ADG floor heights. Additionally, the increase in the tower height allows for an appropriate lift overrun, but does not permit an additional storey.
- Extend the footprints of the southern massing/podium further south to provide a variable setback of 8 to 12m, rather than a 12m continuous setback, without impacting the retention of significant trees, where possible.
- Extend the upper podium setbacks by 3m to the south-eastern boundary. The extension maintains an appropriate transition in heights to the surrounding context.
- The height of the built form within the central The central zone (Flex Zone) between the northern stepped built form and tower built form can accommodate increased building heights of up to 4 storeys.

The footprint of the tower envelope has not extended. The envelope can accommodate a tower footprint of 1,000m2 GBA. Anything larger than this would be too bulky and cause visual and overshadowing impacts.

	SJB INITIAL BUILDING ENVELOPE	PROPONENT RESPONSE	SJB FINAL RECOMMENDATION
MAINTAIN R3 ZONING R3 Medium Density zone to be maintained.	✓ R3 Medium Density zoning is maintained	✓ R3 Medium Density zoning is maintained	✓ R3 Medium Density zoning is maintained
HEIGHT TRANSITIONS Increases in height must provide a transition to Trumper park and the adjoining residential.	✓ Height transition is considered through appropriate setbacks and steps in form between podiums and terraces with a generous setback of the tower envelope from boundaries facing Trumper Park and residential.	○ Proposed increases to envelope height and reduced setbacks on southern and eastern boundaries of the tower do not provide an adequate transition to Trumper Park and residential areas.	✓ Building envelope heights are minimally increased, and proposed setback reductions minimise visual impact and maintain appropriate height transition.
STEP DOWN, REFLECT & RELATE TO EDGECLIFF COMMERCIAL CENTRE Proposed height of any tower should step down from the Edgecliff Commercial Centre to reflect the height strategy of the draft Edgecliff Commercial Centre Strategy. Height of any podiums need to relate to adjoining development and open space areas.	✓ Tower height of 90mRL (18 storeys) maintains a height transition and steps down from the Edgecliff Commercial Centre. Height of podiums and terraces relate to adjoining areas.	○ Proposed tower height of 93.4mRL (19 storeys) reduces amount of height transition and step-down from the Edgecliff Commercial Centre and creates a more dominant building in the skyline when viewed from a distance.	✓ Tower height of 91mRL (18 storeys) slightly increased to accomodate lift overrun. Height of podiums and terraces also slightly increased to accommodate BCA/NCC requirements.
12 STOREY BUILDING HEIGHT A height guide of 12 storeys with a transition to the adjoining low density residential development and Trumper Park.	○ 18 storey maximum building height is not perceived as impacting the surrounding areas and the relationship to the ECC.	○ Proposed envelope height of 93.4m RL (19 storeys) could allow an extra storey (above 18) which would impact the surrounding areas and the relationship to the ECC.	○ Tower height of 91mRL (18 storeys) is appropriate to accommodate minimal impacts on surrounding areas and maintain the relationship to the ECC.
CONSIDER OVERSHADOWING, VIEW, AND BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS Overshadowing of Trumper Park and residential development within the HCA, views and potential biodiversity impacts need to be considered.	✓ Envelope considers overshadowing of surrounding context, minimises view impacts through tower envelope footprint, and considers biodiversity impacts with an envelope that retains as many significant trees as possible.	✗ Proposed increases to the size of the envelope would increase overshadowing and visual impacts, and biodviersity may also be impacted by increased setbacks at lower levels.	✓ Envelope considers overshadowing of surrounding context by maintaining initial tower footprint with minor changes to envelope to accommodate BCA/ NCC requirements, and also minimises visual and biodiversity impacts.

Recommended Building Envelope

Based on the analysis, a revised building envelope has been formulated which accommodates feedback from the proponent where possible, while ensuring a satisfactory performance against the Panel design principles.

This revised building envelope (SJB Final Recommendation) includes the following key components:

Height:

- A maximum overall height of RL91, with a maximum of 18 storeys to the development provides an appropriate relationship to scale of the Edgecliff Commercial Centre, by stepping down in height.
- Variable maximum building heights that minimise overshadowing of Trumper Park and adjoining development, as well as visual impacts.
- Maximum street wall of 6 storeys to ensure the development relates to the adjoining development within the Edgecliff Commercial Centre
- A 3 storey height along southern edge of the site to provide an appropriate transition to the HCA

Setbacks:

- Side setbacks that maximise retention of significant trees and minimise associated biodiversity impacts.
- Side setbacks that maximise achievement of ADG building separation/setback criteria.

Floor Space Ratio (FSR):

- The building envelope results in a FSR of 3.6:1 to 3.7:1

Towers:

- The identification of a tower zone on site is required to minimise overshadowing of Trumper Park and the adjoining residential development .
- The tower zone can accommodate a tower with a maximum footprint of 1000m2 (GBA) or 750m2 (GFA).

Dwelling Mix:

UNIT TYPE	MIN.	MAX.	NSA
1 Bedroom	30%	50%	50-60SQM
2 Bedroom	30%	50%	75-85SQM
3 Bedroom	20%	40%	95-110SQM

Additional Considerations:


In addition to satisfying the ADG, the recommended building envelope will form the basis of site specific provisions to be incorporated into WDCP. To ensure the realisation of the building envelope, the provisions will need to include clear requirements relating to:

- Maximum tower footprints
- Tower zone/location
- Maximum overall heights in storeys
- Distribution of heights across the site
- Tree retention
- Dwelling mix




Envelope & Controls

The Proponent response includes decreased setbacks along the southern and western boundary along with an extension of the envelope to capture the interface with the terraces to the east.



Envelope & Controls

The overall height is also proposed to increase which could technically accommodate 19 storeys, as opposed to the recommended 18. Some minor changes have also been proposed to increase heights to accommodate BCA/NCC requirement.





Envelope adjustments as proposed by Matthew Pullinger
Architect, fjstudio and Planning Ingenuity



Envelope & Controls

The increased envelope would also impact biodiversity and the retention of some significant trees on the periphery of the site.

SJB INITIAL BUILDING ENVELOPE



PROPONENT RESPONSE




Visual Impact


Views have been recreated from Urbaine Design Group’s visual impact assessment report to demonstrate a comparative assessment between the initial building envelope and the Proponent’s responding envelope.

The increase in tower footprint in the Proponent’s responding envelope demonstrates a significant increase in bulk, increasing the overall visual impact.

In particular, the increase in envelope bulk as seen from Trumper Oval results in an inadequate transition in height and scale with the ECC. The extensions to the podium on the eastern boundary and increases in podium heights to accommodate terrace floor-to-floor heights is not seen to impact from these views.



SJB INITIAL BUILDING ENVELOPE




Viewpoint 01 - Rushcutters Bay Park




Viewpoint 02 - Trumper Oval

PROPONENT RESPONSE



Viewpoint 01 - Rushcutters Bay Park




Viewpoint 02 - Trumper Oval


Visual Impact

The significant increase in visual impact from the extensions to tower footprint in the Proponent’s responding envelope can be seen in the view from Cascade Street, which would further increase as you travel down Cascade Street towards New South Head Road.

Additionally the envelope’s visibility from Cameron Street is increased further. While largely hidden by existing trees, the increase in tower height can be prominently seen from this view.



SJB INITIAL BUILDING ENVELOPE




Viewpoint 03 - Cascade Street




Viewpoint 04 - Cameron Street

PROPONENT RESPONSE



Viewpoint 03 - Cascade Street



Viewpoint 04 - Cameron Street


Shadow Study

The shadow studies display shadows created on 21 June (Winter Solstice) from 9am to 3pm. The Proponent’s responding envelope shadow impact is shown in red, with the initial SJB envelope shadow is shown in black.


Proposed extensions to the east and south of the tower footprint, along with an increase to overall height shows a significant increase in overshadowing across all times of day.

KEY


	Initial SJB Envelope Shadow		ECC Shadow
	Proponent Response Shadow		



9AM



10AM




11AM




12PM



1PM



2PM



3PM

SJB Final Recommendation Envelope & Controls

Based on the proposed amendments requested by the Proponent, the assessment of the envelope against the principles, and analysis of visual and overshadowing impacts, an amended envelope recommendation has been made.


- Adjustments to the envelope heights have been made to accommodate NCC and ADG requirements. Increases to podium heights creates minimal to no perceived issues for surrounding areas and is therefore appropriate. The increase to the tower height allows for appropriate lift overruns, but would not permit an additional storey. Access to rooftop spaces would need to be provided within the permissible envelope.
- The flex number of storeys within the flex zone has been increased to accommodate 4 storeys as this would not impact surrounding areas. Height above 4 storeys may impact

- residential amenity within the site and is not encouraged.
- The lower podium has been extended along the south-eastern boundary without impacting significant trees where possible. Further increase would likely impact trees and is not encouraged.
 - Upper podium setbacks have been extended by 3m to the south-eastern boundary, as the extension maintains an appropriate transition in heights to the surrounding context. This change does not cause an impact to surrounding areas and is therefore considered appropriate.
 - The tower envelope's footprint has not been extended, as the envelope is already capable of fitting a tower footprint of 1,000m² GBA. Anything beyond this would be too bulky and cause visual and overshadowing impacts.




Diagrams on the following pages represent a comparison of the final proposed envelope against the initial envelope and the Proponents proposal.

UNIT TYPE	MIN.	MAX.	NSA
1 Bedroom	30%	50%	50-60SQM
2 Bedroom	30%	50%	75-85SQM
3 Bedroom	20%	40%	95-110SQM

GBA > GFA	75%
-----------	-----



Envelope & Controls



Shadow Study

The shadow studies display shadows created on 21 June (Winter Solstice) from 9am to 3pm. The final envelope recommendation is compared against the initial envelope and the Proponent's response.

The shadow study shows the difference in overshadowing impact when the initial tower envelope is maintained, where increases to the shadow of the final recommendation are only present in the lower podium levels and provide lower impact than the Proponent response.

At 9am the proposed shadow extent sits almost entirely within the shadow extent of the ECC proposed. At 10am, there a small impact to properties across Trumper Park, however these properties will receive adequate sunlight for the remainder of the day. From 12pm, private open spaces of the terraces in the adjacent properties are being impacted slightly by the proposed, however they are also being impacted by the proposed ECC massing and will still receive adequate sunlight throughout the day of greater than 3 hours total.


KEY

Initial SJB Envelope Shadow


ECC Shadow

Proponent Response Shadow


SJB Final Recommendation



9AM




10AM



11AM




12PM



1PM



2PM



3PM


Visual Impact

Views have been recreated from Urbaine Design Group’s visual impact assessment report to demonstrate a comparative assessment between the preferred approach and the planning proposal massing.


The images compare the visual impact of the SJB Final Recommendation envelope and the Proponent’s response envelope.

In maintaining the current tower envelope, the visual impacts are significantly reduced. Views from Rushcutters Bay Park maintain an appropriate transition between the ECC massing and surrounding areas with a similar effect taking place when viewed from Trumper Park. By maintaining the initial tower footprint the reduction in visual impact from the southern corner of the tower envelope is evident from this view.

SJB INITIAL BUILDING ENVELOPE




Viewpoint 01 - Rushcutters Bay Park




Viewpoint 02 - Trumper Oval

PROPONENT RESPONSE




Viewpoint 01 - Rushcutters Bay Park




Viewpoint 02 - Trumper Oval

SJB FINAL RECOMMENDATION



Viewpoint 01 - Rushcutters Bay Park






Viewpoint 02 - Trumper Oval

Visual Impact

Views from Cascade Street demonstrate that the proposed largely sits within the ECC silhouette, whilst still providing appropriate visual hierarchy to the ECC massing.

From Cameron Street, situated between the terraces to the south-east of the site, the impact to views is similarly reduced, with extensions to the podium remaining largely obscured.



SJB Envelope Testing




Following adjustment of the building envelope, an additional massing approach has been tested to ensure the resultant built form would still be appropriate within the proposed final envelope.

The footprints of the southern massing have been extended to fit within the final envelope, and the tower extended to create a 1,000m² GBA footprint. The resultant built form is 18 storeys and 3.6:1.

This approach maintains:

- A street wall height of 6 storeys, which is 1 lower than the proposed Edgecliff Centre, establishing an appropriate relationship in height,
- Transition to the HCA by stepping down to 3 storeys, aligning with the adjacent terrace.
- Significant tree retention through the proposed articulation and setbacks to side boundaries, including those along the eastern interface.

There is potential to increase the total FSR with more aggressive massing within the envelope (subject to ADG, residential mix and considerations of established principles). This has also been shown here in lighter pink and red text. These elements would allow the FSR to increase to 3.7:1 without significant impacts to residential amenity or to surrounding areas. However, appropriate consideration should be given to how the development is read from the street frontage, by minimising street wall length.



SJB is passionate about the possibilities of architecture, interiors, urban design and planning. Let's collaborate.

Gadi Country
Level 2, 490 Crown Street
Surry Hills NSW 2010

T 61 2 9380 9911
E sydney@sjb.com.au
W sjb.com.au

